97-84109-6

Republican Club,
Utica, New York

Speeches delivered at the Lincoln dinner of the...

[Utica]

[1920]

97-84109-6
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

OLUC 36920509 Record 1 of 1
HELD BY PR1 - NO OTHER HOLDINGS
OCLC: 36920509 Rec stat: n
Entered: 19970516 Replaced: 19970516 Used: 19970516
Type: a ELvl: K Srce: d Audn: Ctrl: Lang: eng
BLvl: m Form: a Conf: 0 Biog: MRec: Ctry: xx
Cont: GPub: Fict: 0 Indx: 0
Desc: a Ills: Fest: 0 DtSt: s Dates: 1920, ↔
1 040 PR1 ▾c PR1 ↔
2 007 h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i c ▾j p ↔
3 007 h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i a ▾j p ↔
4 007 h ▾b d ▾d a ▾e f ▾f a--- ▾g b ▾h a ▾i b ▾j p ↔
5 049 PR1A ↔
6 110 2 Republican Club, Utica, New York. ↔
7 245 10 Speeches delivered at the Lincoln dinner of the Republican Club of Utica ▾h [microform] : ▾b Thursday evening, February 12, 1920, Hotel Utica, Utica, New York. ↔
8 260 [Utica : ▾b Republican Club of Utica, ▾c 1920] ↔
9 300 35 p. : ▾b ill. ; ▾c 24 cm. ↔
10 500 Copy filmed: Presentation copy signed by Thomas R. Proctor. ↔

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm **REDUCTION RATIO:** 11:1 **IMAGE PLACEMENT:** IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 6-4-97 **INITIALS:** PB

TRACKING # : 21866

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Compliments of
Thomas R. Proctor

Box

SPEECHES

LINCOLN DINNER

FEBRUARY 12, 1920

THE LINCOLN DINNER

SPEECHES

DELIVERED AT THE

LINCOLN DINNER

OF THE

REPUBLICAN CLUB
OF UTICA

Thursday Evening, February 12, 1920

Hotel Utica

Utica, New York

8 June 1920 Snd

The Lincoln Dinner

The sixth Lincoln Dinner, under the auspices of the Republican Club of Utica, was held at Hotel Utica on the evening of February 12, 1920, and was attended by 425 men.

The speakers were Hon. Miles Poindexter, United States Senator from Washington; Rt. Rev. Charles Vincent Fiske, Bishop co-adjutor of the Episcopal Diocese of Central New York; and Dr. Elmer B. Bryan, President of Colgate University. Mr. Thomas R. Proctor, honorary president of the Republican Club, was toastmaster.

Seated at the table with the speakers were: Hon. P. C. J. DeAngelis and Hon. Irving R. Devendorf, justices of the Supreme Court; Hon. James K. O'Connor, Mayor of Utica, and John G. Thomas, president of the Republican Club. The table was beautified by a basket of orchids and roses, the gift of Mrs. Thomas R. Proctor.

In point of attendance the dinner was the largest in the history of the club, both the ball room and the Italian room being filled when the diners sat down at 8 o'clock. Banquet favors in the shape of tiny American flags, pins, and Lincoln buttons, contributed by the Payfitch Company, were at each place, together with Boy Scout pins, significant of the campaign of the latter organization.

As usual the toastmaster opened the program by reading the Gettysburg address from a book presented to him by Robert Lincoln, son of Abraham Lincoln. Music and song enlivened the evening, the most striking number being given about the time the coffee was served, when, led by Ted Lloyd, the entire company arose as one man and sang "How Dry I Am."

DR. ELMER B. BRYAN

Speech of Dr. Elmer B. Bryan

Mr. Chairman, Senator, and Gentlemen: This gathering reminds me of a non-partisan meeting which I attended a few years ago at the Armory, at which the speakers were Senator Root, Senator Depew, and Vice President Sherman. It was strictly a non-partisan meeting. (Laughter.) This is a graduated scheme this evening. We are beginning with the kindergarten, and we will finish with the post-graduate course of the university. We have the Law and the Gospel. Just what function I am to perform I am not sure. I suppose, being a college president, I am to play the part of a politician, pure and simple. (Applause and laughter.) I feel a little this evening as the stutterer did, who-who c-c-ca-came to-to t-t-t-town b-by fr-fr-freight. They asked him why he came by freight and he said he c-c-couldn't express himself. (Laughter). These are the only occasions on which I ever wish that I possessed money. Of course you know that it is not a feeling that lingers with me, or I should not continue to be a college president. But on such occasions as this I do wish I had money. You know money talks. But I never heard it say anything but "Good-bye." (Laughter.) I think I am put up here to illustrate a freak of nature — a sport. You know your biology well enough to know that organisms sometimes manifest themselves in that way, and I think I can serve that perhaps pretty well. Was there ever a greater freak of nature than this, that a man bearing the name of Bryan should be the guest of a Republican Club? (Laughter.) Or that you should ever behold anyone bearing that name who is actually a president of anything? (Laughter.) I told the Judge sitting at my left that I am going to do something this evening that the oldest inhabitant had never dreamed could be done. I am going to continue to bear my name and I am going to make a short speech. My speech is like a local freight. I can cut it in two any place, hang on a caboose, and it is made up. (Laughter.)

I judge that we are met under the auspices of the Republican Club. Not one out of a hundred of you has earned the right

to meet under such auspices as I have. You have come into this thing as you came into your name, as you came by your ancestry, as you came by the land of your nativity — you were born that way. You are that way because you don't know any better. But I got up and came in. Away back yonder, about the middle nineties, there was a reason. That is. there was a situation without any reason. (Laughter.) I am one because I do know better. It is about the only thing I do know. This is Lincoln Day. We have met here at a Lincoln dinner, under the auspices of the Republican Club, the feeling perhaps being that Lincoln was a life-long Republican. We know better, of course. We know that he had been voting twenty-five years before there was a Republican party. We know that before the Republican party was ten years old Lincoln was dead. We know that the Republican party was called into existence because the two parties that had been running along failed to adjust themselves and adopt themselves and to do the urgent business of the nation. And the Republican party was born. It was not all gain, that a new party needed to be born to do that work. But when atrophy and stupidity and an unwillingness to face new situations when they arise overtake a political party, if political parties will not move up, If they will not do the tasks, if they will not undertake the jobs, we American people have a mind and a heart to see to it that agencies will be created whereby the work of the nation will be accomplished. And the Republican party was called into existence away back in the middle fifties. It was on the job during the days of the Civil War, and the days of reconstruction, which are not yet ended. It has passed through many vicissitudes. It has done work of immeasurable moment. Today the country is in a situation. The world is in a fix. We are all brethren. We are right here in the bosom of the family. The question that confronts every one of us is, shall we harken back to tradition and the tasks nobly done, to the exclusion of facing manfully the critical situation all about us today. It will be a pity if we do. It will be a terrible loss if we do. It will be a shame if we do. I have often said that there is no question at all that the world will be taken for Christianity, and I have often said that I am not quite so sure whether the

agent for this accomplishment will continue to be the church. But it will be a terrible pity, an unspeakable loss, an uncontrovertible evidence of stupidity, if the church does not continue to be the agencies whereby the Kingdom of God shall be brought into the hearts of the people. Now, gentlemen, it is a question whether we are wise enough and good enough and brave enough, as members of this great organization, to see to it that standing upon a foundation, upon traditions of which every right-minded man may well be proud, we shall turn our hands and our hearts and our heads to the tasks that confront us, such as the world has never seen before. And in doing this, Abraham Lincoln gave the method. He presented the motive. He handed down the torch which carries the light and conveys the urge, when he said, "With malice towards none, with charity for all." We have in this country a few covetous and grasping "haves." We have in this country a few covetous, clawing "have nots." We have in this country a multitude of right-minded people who are too quiescent. We have on the one hand the high ideal destructive radical. On the other hand the stupid reactionary conservative. Then we have the great multitude of people who are falling victims through their quiescence. Now, if we are going to come out of this thing, it will not be done by following the program laid down by any one of the forty-five people who a little while ago wrote paragraphs on the way out. They are all nice little paragraphs, and not one gets the answer, in my judgment. But it will be by being as thoughtful as we can be. By being as thoughtful as we can be. There is the only program. I lay it down and then sit down. It is this. It is the program that Lincoln gave us. It is the urge which alone can carry us through. It is the spirit which alone can save the day. With malice towards none, with charity for all. With loyalty for our nation and her institutions. With respect and good-will for all decent-minded peoples. (Applause.)

RT. REV. CHARLES VINCENT FISKE

Speech of Rt. Rev. Charles Vincent Fiske

Mr. Proctor, Mr. Senator, and Gentlemen: Mr. Proctor, you know, is a good chairman, and of course he has introduced me in the right way. I have been introduced a great many ways. I have been introduced as the Bishop Co-Agitator. I have been introduced at a meeting of the State Bankers as the Bishop Coadjuster. But being a good chairman, Mr. Proctor introduced me the right way, as the Bishop Coadjutor, with the accent on the Jew.

There are two very puzzling things to me whenever I attend meetings of this sort. The first puzzle that is a mystery to me is this: Why in the world is it that men want to hear speeches? And then the second puzzle is: Why in the world do they want to hear me? Why in the world do they want to hear speeches? Not long ago there was in one of our monthly magazines a very interesting theological treatise entitled, "Is after-dinner speaking a disease?" I read it through, and as near as I could discover it was thought by the writer to be a disease on the part of those who heard and on the part of those who spoke. There was a curious suggestion that there was something about the flowers and the lights and the reflection from the eyes of the audience that set most speakers into a hypnotic state. They were lost to everything. They were lost to the fact that anybody was going to succeed them as speakers. They usually rambled on for three-quarters of an hour, giving a rehash of all the things that they had ever said in all the speeches that they had ever given on all previous occasions. I want to say that since I have heard that admirable address by President Bryan I begin to discover why people want to hear speeches, and I begin to see that every speaker is not hypnotized in that way. He set an admirable example to the rest of us in the brevity of his remarks. The author of that little article in the Atlantic tells a very interesting story about an ambitious young man who went to one of his seniors and said, "How can I become a great public speaker? Shall I do as Demosthenes did? Shall I practice with pebbles in

my mouth?" He said, "My young man, if you want to be really successful, don't put pebbles in your mouth. Use Portland cement." (Laughter.) I suppose it is a fairly good rule, but there are times when even the most cautious after-dinner speaker couldn't follow it. And I think this is an occasion tonight. I don't know when I have seen an assemblage of men like you. Judge DeAngelis, I once studied law, and I was told that the first thing to do when addressing the jury was to make yourself straight with the jury by telling them what fine fellows they are. I am not doing the same thing to you tonight, but I do want to say that never in all my public speaking have I seen quite such a company as is gathered here this evening, and you are an inspiration to any speaker.

I wonder if I will be pardoned as a Bishop if I tell two stories that I ought not to tell? The first has to do with that matter of inspiration. I told it first some two years ago down at Annapolis, just as we were getting into the war. I preached to the men, twenty-two hundred of them, in the chapel of the Academy at Annapolis, and then in the evening we had an informal service over in Memorial Hall. I was warned that it was to be very informal; in charge of the cadets themselves. At luncheon I had been at Admiral Eberle's, and I had met a number of upper class officers, and we had smoked and talked and told stories, and I told the mouse story. Afterwards I was entertained by Chaplain Evans, an old friend of mine, and there we smoked and told stories, and I told my story again. I was expecting a very unconventional religious service at night, but I didn't expect what happened next, after we had had the hymns and the prayer and a few other things. I was introduced by the cadet presiding, and I had no sooner stepped to the front of the platform when a voice in the rear of the room said, "Tell us the mouse story." I had my sermon all fixed up and I didn't know how I could get in the mouse story, and I said, "That is not proper for this occasion." And another man said, "Bishop, we want the mouse story." And the rest didn't know what the mouse story was, and with one voice they said, "We want the mouse story." And I had to tell it: Once upon a time there was a little mouse who lived in a house, the cellar of which was a wine cellar. This was in

the old days, Judge DeAngelis. (Laughter.) I don't want to tack it on him, because he may have to pass on cases of this sort. It was in the old days. All around the walls of the cellar were casks filled with the good old stuff. One night a little mouse, whose life had been made perfectly miserable by a cat that chased him, came out cautiously from his hole and made his way across the cellar floor. In front of one of the casks where the spigot had been left a little loose there was a pool, and he got his feet in the pool. He pulled out and shook and shivered all over, and then licked off his feet. Then he stopped and thought. Then he waded in with all four feet, and then he got out and licked them dry once more. And then he thought very seriously for a few moments, and then he got in the pool and rolled around and around until he had rolled it all dry, and then he diligently licked himself off all over. Then he jumped up the cellar stairs, leaping up two steps at a time, until he got to the top step, where he cocked his head on one side, and then he cocked it on the other, and he said, "Now, where is that damned cat that chased me?" (Laughter and applause). You can quite imagine that that wasn't any kind of a story with which to start a sermon. You can quite imagine that I had to think pretty quick, and so I said to the men, there are two explanations and excuses I want to give for telling the story. You made me tell it, and if I told it I had to give the exact language of the mouse or it would have fallen flat. The second explanation and excuse was this, that it has a moral, and the moral is, there isn't any job too big for a man to tackle if he has the right kind of inspiration.

So I preface my remarks as to wonderment and mystery about why people want to hear any speeches by saying that at least it is a mighty poor kind of a Bishop or College President or United States Senator who would not speak, whether people wanted to hear him or not, when they had the inspiration of an assemblage like this. Not only have I been wondering why people wanted to hear speeches, but I have been wondering why you wanted to hear me. It is quite an extraordinary thing, I am sure, that at a meeting of a Republican Club, though it is quite characteristic of the Republican party, that you should have as your three speakers a leader in education,

a leader in religion, as well as a leader in legislation. I take it that I have been asked here this evening, not by way of personal compliment, but because of the essentially high character of the gathering which has met together tonight — a gathering which has met together not simply as a Republican Club, but a gathering which has assembled here to pay tribute to one who was a firm believer in American representative democracy in government. I used the word democracy, of course, in other than a political sense. To pay tribute to one who was more than that — who was the embodiment of a great cause, that was essentially a Christian cause. And more than that, to pay tribute to one who had the deepest possible faith in the good sense and the righteousness of the common people of America. And it seems to be quite a fitting thing that when we are gathered together with so high a purpose as that, you should not only ask one of the leaders of the United States Senate and a man who has made a remarkable record not only in college life but in governmental service, and an educational leader, but that you should ask a humble leader in the religious life of the State to speak to you. Of course I couldn't deliver a political speech. I don't suppose that I could even speak about politics at all as a Bishop of the Church. I have my own personal convictions. Never mind about them. I have been telling several people this afternoon what my platform was and they didn't seem to be particularly interested. After all, I am reminded as I stand here this evening of an incident in the life of that great American, Henry George. You have possibly heard of the time when he was carrying on his last great campaign for the mayoralty of the City of New York, and there was a great gathering in Cooper Institute Hall to hear him. On the stage were the representative members of his campaign committee. Before him was an immense audience of plain working men. The chairman of the evening introduced Mr. George, and in introducing him he said, "I introduce to you, gentlemen, the friend of the working man." And Mr. George stepped to the front of the platform and said, "I am not the friend of the working man." There was consternation on the faces of the members of the campaign committee on the platform, and puzzlement in the faces of the men in the audience.

And then he continued, "I am not the friend of the capitalist." A tense wave of relief passed over the platform and the hall. He said, "I am not the friend of the working man. I am not the friend of the capitalist. I am the friend of men as men, without regard to their class or position or inheritance or occupation or social standing." That is exactly the position of the Church of God. And that ought to be the position of every minister in the Church of God, whatever his own political convictions may be. He is a lover of mankind, and he is anxious in every possible way to lift up the ideals and to make clear the vision for the men of America whom he must love. I take it, therefore, that it is in somewhat that way that I am asked to address you this evening. For the brief space that I have I must try to lift your thoughts rather high, as I said. There surely is an inspiration in such a gathering as this, and there is inspiration in the recollection of the meetings and dinners that have preceded this. You have had great men speak to you. I wonder how many of you who are here this evening heard that great speech that was made by one of our greatest American statesmen, Elihu Root, (applause) at the meeting here last year? A man of whom all America is proud, and the man of whom the men of Oneida County are more than proud. It was a great speech, and it is a great thing to be privileged to stand here where he stood last year and to speak to you again.

I take it, therefore, that I am to try if I possibly can to bring some real message for the day and for the hour. And I want to make my message this — an effort to summon you men who are citizens of this generation to serve in the spirit of the great servant of the Republic, in whose memory we are keeping this day, and in loyal effort to seek, just as he sought so patiently, for the great moral issues that underlie the political movements that are going on about us. And in seeking the great moral issues, to seek them in perfect trust and in absolute faith in the rightness and the goodness of the common people of our common country. I don't know, gentlemen, whether I am going to say just exactly the thing you want me to say, and I am not quite sure whether I am going to say it in exactly the way you want me to say it, but I don't believe that it would be worth while for a man in my position to come over

here and speak to you at all if I didn't feel that you gave me freedom to say just exactly the things that are in my heart. And the thing that I feel most keenly in these days is that the real question we have got, every single one of us, to settle, is this: Whether we are going to face the great issues and the great problems and the great possibilities of this day, whether we are going to face them with faith or whether we are going to face them with fear. I don't suppose that any may in all of our history ever had greater cause for wavering in his faith and trust in democracy than did Abraham Lincoln. And yet never for one moment did he really waver. In spite of all of his experience with the weakness of democracy, there never was in him any sign of the slightest wavering in his trust. And the great English Lord Cranwood, who has recently written a creditable biography of Lincoln, the finest biography that has ever been written, says that "it could not be imagined that any experience that he would have had in the future could ever have made his trust and his faith in the common people ever to waver." Now the thing that is burning itself into my consciousness and into my heart and soul during these last few months is that we must, every one of us, exhibit the same faith and the same unwavering trust. We are facing great problems. We are passing through tremendous issues. We are facing great opportunities. And the message I want to bring you is that we must face them with faith and not with fear. Now here comes the part of the message that I am not sure that you will all accept, but I know that you will take it from me in the right spirit. Let me illustrate just exactly what I mean: Here in Utica you had a rather mild sort of excitement for some weeks past over the proposed lecture of a parlor Socialist. By the way, you treated him just exactly the right way. He had an audience, I understand, of one hundred and fifty people to hear him. He was brought here at the most untimely possible moment, when his utterances might have been a firebrand in the midst of a very dangerous industrial situation. But don't let us get into any hysterical fear about it. Don't misunderstand me for one single moment. I haven't any use for dilettante parlor Socialists. There are some Socialists for whom I have respect, but I haven't any respect for that

kind. I haven't any respect whatever for the dilettante Socialist. The rich man who stirs up strife while he enjoys the dividends from his own investments. The society man or the academic theorist who dabbles in radicalism and rejoices in the advocacy of various daring schemes, with about as much sense of his or her responsibility as a little child who plays with fire. The academic lecturer who sows the seed of discontent and makes his own living by doing it — I haven't any use for those people. But, nevertheless, I say, let's not get hysterical about it. Let us face the situation, not with the hysteria of fear, but with absolute faith in America, in that great mass of the in-between-people of whom Dr. Bryan spoke, and in the essential rightness and goodness of the people of our own community. I have faith to believe that the common-sense of the common people will never be carried away captive by any such propaganda. I am saying this because I honestly believe that the safety of this nation lies in the guarantees of freedom, of that freedom of speech, freedom of worship, and freedom of action. I protest against any hysteria of fear that would cause the mouths of such men to howl because of that. We fought Prussianism and we don't want to introduce Prussianism in America. Don't misunderstand me again. Freedom of speech doesn't mean freedom of speech without thinking what you are saying, without thinking of the consequences. Freedom of speech and freedom of action must always stop short of that which is treasonable. Freedom of action and thought must never be allowed to go so far as to advocate force for the overthrow of government. And when freedom of speech, so-called, reaches that point, all righteous Americans must rise up in their wrath and see that the liberty is limited to its right boundaries. But, nevertheless, don't let us get into any fear about it. Let us have faith. I don't know whether it is quite right or permissible for a Bishop of the Church to quote Voltaire, but with certain limitations I am going to quote him to this extent, to say that "I abhor everything you say, but I am willing to fight that you may be permitted to say it." Now, secondly, what I am driving at is, don't let us get into any hysteria of fear. I tremble sometimes for America, and I tremble for the future of the world, but I tremble more because

of the loss of spiritual standards and of the lowering of our ideals of service than I tremble because of the passionate preaching of radicalism, which, after all, possibly has some explanation or excuse in the selfishness and lack of brotherhood that has so often characterized American industry and American economics and American societies. (Applause.)

Now, I am going to make my second application, and here again I don't know whether you are going to agree with me. Whether you agree with me or not, that splendid Republican, who was considered to be a fine enough man to be your standard bearer in the last Presidential election, is on the same side where I stand. It seems to me that the proceedings in Albany at the present time indicate fear rather than faith. Fear rather than faith. It seems to me that they are perilously near the kind of methods that bolshevism has introduced into Russia, where the victorious bolsheviki, as soon as they have taken possession of any part of their country, stamp out the very principles of free speech. Gentlemen, I don't believe that the best way to prevent an explosion is by sitting on the safety valve. I believe that we must face every radical propaganda with faith and not with fear. We believe in the underlying order that will work out without conflict any community of interests between all parties in America. I believe that our great problem is to impart to the parties of industry that confidence in each other and faith in the rightness of their motives. I believe that the great task of the Christian Church today is to impart to industry and to Americans generally that general faith, and as the Bishop of the Church, I protest against anything that creates distrust or fosters class prejudice, that gives the implication in any way that anybody in any legal and constitutional fashion shall not advocate any problem they will. You don't seem to be very enthusiastic about it. But I believe it is at the roots of that American tolerance that has stood the test of time, when Prussian intolerance has failed. (Applause.) And then, finally, I am going to touch now on a subject, Mr. Senator, which I must approach with the greatest tact, and perhaps I can best approach it if I tell you the other story. I wonder if you have been thinking about it? When a Bishop says he is going to tell two improper stories it is pretty hard

thinking of anything he is saying until he gets through with his second story. The second story will illustrate tact: There was a colored gentleman who met a friend of his one day, and he says, "Sam, what is dis here thing what they call tact?" He says, "Can you give me a definition of it?" Sam says, "No, sir. No, I cannot give you no dictionary definition of it, but I can exemplify." So he says, "Sam, exemplify it." And Sam says: "Well, it is this way. You know I work for a plumber. Last week Mrs. Jones, she telephoned the boss, and she said the bathroom fixtures was out of order. And the boss sent me up there to fix them. I had been there before, and when I got there this time Mrs. Jones lets me in and she says, 'Good morning. Is you come to fix the bathroom?' I says yes, and she says, 'You know where it is. You go right up yourself.' So I went upstairs, and I forgot there was two bathrooms, and I got to the wrong one. The door was shut, but it wasn't locked, and I turned the knob and walked in. Well, sir, there was a lady in there with her birthday clothes on, taking a bath. So I just backs out as quick as I could and I shut the door, and I says, 'Excuse me, SIR.' (Laughter.) That is what I call tact." With that explanation and with a story like that to make you good-humored in the remarks that follow, I want to approach very delicately my third illustration of faith and not fear. I think that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln calls us to face world problems with the same faith with which I have summoned you to face American problems. I will not permit any thread of entangling alliance or any threatened loss of American prestige and privilege to make me hesitate in having America accept her place and position in the world. The one thing that I am dreadfully afraid of is this, that as Israel of old, having received the privileges and the revelation, refused to pass it on and to make known to others the God who had been made known to them, and so lost its place and power — my fear is that possibly America may cherish her privilege too selfishly, instead of realizing that all that we have and all that we are has been given us in trust to pass on to the world, in order that we may so rise through victory, that we may give to the world that sense of fellowship which will make it possible for the nations of the earth to bring their honor and their glory unto God's

kingdom. That is my one fear for America today. My fear is not about any new step that we are to take, but it is a fear lest with the door of opportunity open we shall be afraid to go in. Now, I want to make myself perfectly clear again. I don't want to be misunderstood. America is unwilling to be dragged into turmoil and strife of European suspicion and envy. And I am one of those who believes in such reservations for the treaty and the League of Nations as shall make it perfectly plain that we don't intend to be dragged into that strife and turmoil. I am glad of those who believe that the plainer it is written the larger will be our contribution to lasting peace. Let me make it plain again: I am one of those who deplore the lack of statesmanlike sagacity that has only succeeded in making the League of Nations a party question when it might so easily have been the result of the counsel of the great men of every party. I am one of those who regret that it could not have been made the free choice of all America, rather than the counsel of individualistic isolation. But, nevertheless and notwithstanding, I believe that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, of essential faith and not fear, demands that we shall do our part and take our place in that which furnishes at any rate the only reasonable hope that the world has for lasting peace. (Applause.) I believe that we shall have to do it, even on the most selfish possible motives, because I don't believe that any nation can give itself over to the consideration of its own salvation only. I believe with the world on fire, all in conflagration, there is tremendous danger that the fire will start near home, and I want to get into the fire brigade and stop it if I can. I believe that the spirit of Abraham Lincoln would call us to that venture of faith. In saying all that I have said tonight, I honestly and in the bottom of my heart believe that I am speaking in the spirit of that great founder of your party, whose name and whose service we are celebrating tonight. I believe that the great call today is for service. I am trying to sound that call myself to the individual. With most of the clergy of most of the Christian Churches, we are trying to sound that call to the Church — the call to service. And I want to beg you men to consider tonight whether it is not your duty, as it is mine, to sound the same call of service to the nations. I thank you. (Applause.)

HON. MILES POINDEXTER

Speech of Senator Miles Poindexter

Mr. Proctor and Gentlemen: The very eloquent remarks of the two distinguished gentlemen who have preceded me in regard to the need of a breadth of view that rises above the lines of party in dealing with the great, vital and crucial issues which are now affecting the destinies not only of America but of the world, with them I heartily agree. What they have said along that line reminds me somewhat of the difficulties of a distinguished acquaintance of mine who served the Government very effectively during the great war through which we have just passed, and who has some high political aspirations. And he is of such importance that the political parties of the country are actually fighting over him. The Democratic party claims he is a Republican, and the Republican party claims he is a Democrat.

I esteem it a great honor to stand in this place where so many great men of the nation have stood in years past at this great annual event, and particularly to sit by the side of your distinguished fellow-townsman, the chairman of the evening. (Applause.) Long before I reached your city I had known of Mr. Proctor, and had heard upon all sides of his magnanimous public spirit, and the services which he had rendered to this great community. I am glad to appear in the home of that great leader of the Republican party, now gone hence, your fellow-citizen, the Honorable Jim Sherman. (Applause.) It was my privilege when I first entered the Senate of the United States to sit under him as presiding officer of that body. And it was the universal tribute of those whom he served and over whom he presided, that no fairer and no abler parliamentarian and presiding officer had ever presided over the Senate of the United States. (Applause.) It has been my genuine pleasure to form an acquaintance more or less intimate in our common service in the affairs of the nation with your two distinguished Senators who now represent this leading State of the nation in that branch of the national legislature. And I take advantage of this opportunity before these typical leading

Republicans of New York to express the opinion that there are not two more efficient, more zealous public servants in the Senate of the United States than Senator Calder and Senator Wadsworth. (Applause.) I think that it was largely through the courtesy, perhaps on the suggestion in the first place at least, of your representative in Congress from this district, that I was done the great honor, as I consider it and know it to be, to be present upon this occasion. I want to congratulate the people of this district, regardless of party, on the growing influence of Representative Snyder. (Applause.)

Now, passing to the real purpose of this occasion, of perpetuating, so far as we can in our humble way, the spirit and the principles of that immortal citizen of the Republic and President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, I want to refer to the esteem of him by a foreigner, whose name has been mentioned by Bishop Fiske, and I agree with him that the finest book of Abraham Lincoln has been written by this citizen of another country. And it often happens that in that detachment of you, that removal from prejudice, of personal conflicts and party struggle, a truer view is obtained of the leaders of a nation by those of another country than their own. Lord Charnwood in his splendid biography of Lincoln esteems him to have been one of the supremely great men of the last three centuries. And he attributes his greatness to those simple and elemental qualities, a purity of purpose and a directness of intellect which enabled Lincoln to deal in the clearest possible light with every question with which he was confronted. I want to read from the book, in order that I may not be misquoted (I am very glad to read from this book, because Mr. Proctor tells me it was presented to him by a son of Abraham Lincoln), these words: "Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth upon this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure." In that task, in the desperate emergencies of civil war, Abraham Lincoln, as the leader of the nation, preserved the principles which he there expressed, and handed down to those who have followed him the blessings of a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. And if there is a practical purpose in these gatherings from year to year in which we mention his name and review his life, it is not for any honor that we can bestow upon his immortal name. But if I perceive correctly, the value and the purpose of these proceedings, it is that we may imbue ourselves with his spirit, and in our day and generation may be true to the test which is presented, not in the form of civil war, but in the form of a political question, or foreign war perhaps, from which will be determined the perpetuity of this nation, and whether we shall pass on that liberty which we received. Now, it is not enough to express high ideals. We agree that men should be free to speak their mind. That there should be a free press, that there should be free speech, because those things are guaranteed in the Constitution, and it is for the perpetuity of that Constitution in the menace which confronts us in our day and generation that we should exert ourselves as Lincoln and his compatriots met the issues of theirs.

One thing that I am very much impressed with was mentioned by Bishop Fiske, that many of those who speak most vehemently about the right of free speech and of free press, when they are established in power, as they were in Russia, immediately proceed to establish a despotism. They suppress the freedom of speech, and the free press. A cigarmaker's employee from Philadelphia became the censor of the press of Russia, and the way in which he showed his affection for these principles of liberty was to put to death every man who published a newspaper expressing a view contrary to his own. I read in the morning paper of a man in New York, an Alderman in that city, who declared that he was devoted to the German people as he always had been and always would be. Now, there are some things that we are entitled to exact of American citizenship, along with the freedom of the press and freedom of speech, and one of those things is that when the nation is struggling for its existence against a foreign foe we are entitled to exact loyalty from those who live under its flag. And for one I can see no inconsistency in enforcing the demand that those who would hold office and exercise the responsibility of power under the American Constitution, should be

loyal to that Constitution. I am told — I know nothing about it except what I am told and I don't care to enter into the discussion — that certain members, members-elect of the Assembly of New York, whose right to hold seats has been questioned, and that is a matter for you to determine and not for me, have declared their approval by solemn resolution of the soviet government of Russia. If that is true they are giving their support to an organization which is waging war upon the United States. The trouble about a great manay people is that they have a false conception of self-governing. We have been extremely liberal in opening our hospitable ports to immigrants from all nations of the world, and many of them come to this country believing that self-government means a government in which there is no obedience to the law. It may be that that is a perfectly natural understanding on the part of those who have not been trained in those various principles which the Anglo-Saxon race has evolved through the struggles of a thousand years, but nevertheless it is true. And it requires a long period of time for them to learn that self-government is the opposite of that. Instead of being disobedient to the law, it means the capacity of men under a government which they themselves have erected and which they through their ballots control, to submit themselves to the adjudication of the officials of the government.

I want to speak for a moment about a proclamation which was put out a few days ago by the American Federation of Labor. This great body has had the good will and I think still has the good will of the American people. It has done much good for labor. And yet I am very much afraid that under the leadership which is now manifesting itself, that it is in a fair way of injuring, if not destroying, its usefulness, not only to labor but to the nation. In this declaration they demand that no man shall be elected to the Congress of the United States that is not approved by them, who does not advocate views, as they express it, which are friendly to them. They say in this declaration that all of the legislation which was proposed in the Bill of Grievances, as they denominate it, of the Federation of Labor of 1906, were enacted into the law. They use some profane language in reference to Con-

gress, and I don't know that Congress at times is not deserving of cussing. They indulge in certain generalities. One of the misfortunes of the American Federation of Labor at the present time is that they have upon their staff a number of communist writers, many of them tinged with bolshevism, who know a great deal more about the use of language than they do either about work or government. They say that Congress has made an attack upon the ideals of democracy, and yet the only specific piece of legislation which they mention is that which was proposed as the railroad bill, to prohibit and penalize the tying up of the transportation of the country. Well, Congress has rejected that, and I fail to see why in complying with the wishes of the American Federation of Labor in regard to the only thing which they specify, it should come under their condemnation. But it is a general principle of this proclamation, which I wish briefly to refer to, a demand on the part of this organization, presumably representing the employees of the industry of the country to a large extent, not to as large an extent as we would suppose, that there should be a Congress of the United States subservient to the American Federation of Labor. The result of any such proposition as that would be that the principle which Abraham Lincoln quoted from the Declaration of Independence in his remarkable speech at Gettysburg, "this nation is dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal," would come to an end when class rule of labor was established in the Congress of the United States. I haven't the slightest idea that the assertion contained in this pronouncement of the American Federation of Labor, that labor would follow the leaders of that organization in such a movement, and that the farmers of the country would cooperate with them to bring about that result, is true. There is nothing in that to indicate that the farmers of the nation, at least, and I believe that the same thing applies to the rank and file of the labor of the country, will join in any move which menaces today, as the Civil War did in the days of Lincoln, the integrity of our institutions, and to bring about a rule by which there would be recognized by the action of Congress the right of employees of industry and of transportation to tie up transportation, to

shut down essential industries, by an agreement among themselves for that purpose, to bring the people of this nation in cold and hunger under a subjugation and coercion of physical intimidation to as great an extent as though an armed force stood at the gates of the Capitol and demanded legislation at the point of a bayonet. This anti-strike legislation which was referred to in this current announcement that I have mentioned is spoken of in that document as an effort to impose involuntary servitude upon the laborers of this country. Now Congress cannot pass any law imposing involuntary servitude upon labor. If they pass any such law it would be perfectly void, as though it had never been passed. It is in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. No sane man in Congress, I think there may be some there that are not sane, and I don't know that even those who are not, have ever proposed to enact any such law. What was proposed in the Railroad Bill, which was pending and which I am glad to say is now in a fair way of being enacted into law, was a provision for a penalty to be imposed upon those who agreed among themselves not to quit work, but agreed among themselves to hinder or obstruct the movements of others, or their facilities of interstate commerce in the movement of commodities upon the railroad. And there was an express reservation that it should not interfere with the right to quit work, either singly or collectively. And so the issue is presented to the country, and I want to say that Mr. Gompers and the American Federation of Labor have a perfect right to present the issue when they propose the method which they do propose, that it shall be decided at the ballot-box. But in that test it is for the American people to determine whether the people of this country, of all classes, capital or labor, or those who are neither, the great Republic of ninety-five millions of people, as compared with a few million of those who belong to this organization, shall be able to administer the laws in the interests of the public, or whether they shall surrender that jurisdiction into the hands of a small coterie of men who would constitute a government within the Republic and not subject to its laws.

Now, I agree with what has been said here this evening about the duty of the people of the United States and their

government to cooperate with the world in the adjustment of its international problems. A great deal has been said to the effect that we cannot live in isolation. And when did we ever live in isolation? When was the American nation not in intimate social and commercial intercourse with every other nation in the world? Washington, while he had a policy which was referred to on all occasions as being opposed to entangling alliances and to participation in the ordinary politics of Europe, at the same time and as a part of the same policy, advocated the cultivation of friendly relations with other nations. And that policy has been followed from that day to this. But the Government of the United States and the people have to determine a more specific question than the question of whether we are to participate in the affairs of the world and bear our just portion of the burdens of humanity. We will all agree to that. Those high idealistic principles no man can dispute, any more than he can dispute the Mosaic law. The fundamental principles of honesty and integrity. When it comes to the making of a specific rule to guide the conduct of men in practical affairs it is necessary for us to determine in what form we shall place these relations to connect the government of the United States with the government of other nations. I sat at a dinner in New York City a short time ago that was presided over by a former Ambassador from the United States to one of the great nations of Europe. There was precipitated there at that meeting a sort of a debate upon the League of Nations. Very much to my surprise, and in remarking upon the subject, the chairman of the evening stated that the League of Nations, if adopted, and he urged its adoption, would deprive the United States only of war power and not interfere with its sovereignty in any other respect. He said that it was true that it would deprive this government of the war power. And he believed that in the interest of the peace of the world this government should be deprived of its war power. I took occasion to remind him that while every good fighter would go a long ways around to avoid a conflict, that when every other expediency had been exhausted, it has been necessary in the brief story of the development of the American people that they should exercise in defence of the principles of the Con-

stitution the right of war. No one desires war, and yet it was only through war that this nation was established. It is only through war when every other expediency had been exhausted that under the leadership of that immortal man whose name we honor tonight, the Union was preserved. It was only through war that the despotism of Spain was lifted from the suffering people of Cuba, and an independent nation now smiles happily in the Caribbean Sea. And it was only through war when every other expediency had been adopted that the march of the German horde was stopped and civilization was saved. Mr. Henry VanDyke, a very distinguished clergyman and former representative of the United States at a European port, has told a story of how in 1914 he brought a message from the governments of France and Great Britain to a little white cottage, as he expressed it, in Washington city, and presented it there to the gentleman who resided in it, referring of course to the President of the United States, urging that the United States should join its moral influence, at least, and that might have been sufficient; might instead merely of being a slogan in a political campaign, have kept us out of war, and yet it was refused. And if it is desirable that this nation shall lend its power to curb the attacks of ambition upon the liberties of other people in the future, the right to decide, the right to direct the action of those people whose destinies are entrusted to our government under the Constitution, should remain in the people of the United States (applause), that that nation, dedicated to liberty and which was preserved in the fires of civil war, shall not perish from the earth. (Applause.) The other day in Washington city I happened to be upon a sub-committee of the Naval Affairs Committee, much against my protest, and I went in to participatae in that hearing. The Secretary of the Navy testified. He stated that he believed we ought to have the greatest navy in the world, and he was quite critical of Admiral Sims because someone had said, had quoted as Admiral Sims, that we couldn't hope to rival the power of Great Britain, which Admiral Sims later upon the witness stand said he never said. Secretary Daniels stated that he believed that the United States ought to have the greatest navy in the world. I said, "Haven't you been

advocating that the United States should submit its destinies, so far as naval power is concerned, to Great Britain?" And he seemed to be very much surprised, and said, "No, I haven't." I said, "I understood, and of course this is not in any offensive spirit at all, that you have advocated a program by which Great Britain should retain without diminution her naval power, and that the United States should pledge herself to a program of disarmament." And I asked him if he didn't know it to be a fact that if the League of Nations was adopted that the United States could not build a battleship or enlist a man for the purpose of navigating her naval vessels without the permission of the League of Nations, which required the unanimous consent of every member, including Great Britain and Japan. He said he didn't know that. I suggested to him it was a good thing for him to know. It is a fact, and I am very much afraid my good friend Secretary Daniels, in many of his activities in these matters of international politics, is in the situation of many others who have urged us to ratify the covenant of the League of Nations without dotting an i or crossing a t, although they have never read it and don't know what it contains. (Applause.) This covenant of the League of Nations provides that if a dispute should arise between the United States and Great Britain, or any other country in the world, however vital it might be to the existence of the nation, any dispute, of whatever character, shall be submitted for final decision to a foreign tribunal, and the United States bound to accept its decree. In such a dispute the United States would have no vote. If it was a dispute with any other country than Great Britain, Great Britain would have six votes. In a dispute between any two other countries than the United States we would have one vote. And when we sign the name of the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, to a covenant for the establishment of an international government which shall have the final sovereign and supreme power of determining the destinies of this country, neither the people nor the government of the United States shall have a voice, then the independence and sovereignty of the American people have been bartered away. Those are some of the issues which I had

in mind a moment ago. In referring to the duty of this generation, such men as are gathered here in this meeting tonight, to assume the responsibilities of citizenship in saving the principles of the American Constitution today in order that you may pass on to your children the blessings which you have received from your fathers. The trouble is, it seems to me, that there is sweeping over the world a spirit of internationalism. A proposition to wipe out the boundaries of nations as distinct and separate powers, and to merge them all under one common government. There is nothing new about that. Centralized government of the world has existed in its past, and the struggles from which the American people and their ancestors have lifted themselves from serfdom into partial freedom and finally into the brilliant light of full citizenship under the American Constitution have been struggles through which in bitterness and tears they have fought their way for relief from centralized powers. However it may be disguised and whatever form it may take, the proposition to form again a union with Europe, is taking a back track on that long road which we have followed in the establishment of nationality and the vesting in the American people and their government the absolute control over their own affairs. Of course an International Court of Conciliation furnishes every possible expedient for the avoidance of war, and is the policy of the American people. There was an old race in the athletics of ancient Greece in which the contestants were adjudged not altogether by their speed, but each was required to carry a torch, and the man who arrived first at the goal with his light burning was the victor in the race. Let me adjure you, my fellow citizens, this evening, that in striving for progress, in adjusting ourselves to the new problems which arise in our domestic affairs, in meeting the attack upon the constitution by those that are in our midst, in meeting the menace from internationalism which comes from abroad, that in this race for improvement, in moving forward to adjust ourselves to new conditions, let us beware lest in our desire to advance we lose sight of the necessity of keeping alive the torch of liberty which we received under the constitution. (Applause.) Don't forget that once lost, the old struggle to recover this status

of free men under a government controlled by ourselves can only be recovered through the same toils and tribulations which have been necessary to arrive at our present position. These men gathered here this evening, I see in their faces a purpose of preserving those principles of the American government, those institutions from which we have prospered, which have made the American nation the greatest among all the nations of the world, which have placed American labor in a status which is superior to that of the labor of any other nation. And it is for the determination of the measures which are to be taken to preserve those liberties, with justice to all, without undue hardship upon any, with good will towards men, that we are gathered together to discuss these things, that your government is assembled in Washington. Let me impress upon you that after all the action of the government is but a reflection of the opinions of the people. It is for you in your several communities, in your several capacities as citizens and officials of the State or of the municipality, or of the United States Government, to exercise your influence in the face of the stirring problems which are to be decided in the near future. The League of Nations is now up in the Senate of the United States for early action. I think it will be voted on in a few days. Many distinguished Americans who told us but a short time ago that it was all right when it was first drafted and it should be immediately signed are now telling us that the reservations which have been adopted by the Senate, after much abuse and criticism upon all sides, should by all means be attached to it. A distinguished gentleman and a former member of the Cabinet who resides in the City of New York, announced a strange doctrine a short time ago, that we should have it without representation, and when the League of Nations is assembled in Europe we should send our representatives there to ask them to preserve American independence. If that is the low state to which the American people have fallen, I should be very much depressed and should feel that the future was not particularly bright for the perpetuation of American institutions. But that is not the case. The American people do not desire that the liberties which they have won, and which their fathers have won for themselves, should be

vested in some foreign power, and that we should depend upon the good will or the benevolence of this foreign power or that foreign power to restore them to us. It reminds me a good deal of an Irishman who came home one evening with his face badly battered up, and his wife said, "Who gave you that black eye?" And he said, "Nobody gives you nothing. I had to fight for it." Don't imagine that human nature is changed, or that all evil has been blotted out of the human breast. The eternal struggle between good and good intentions on the one hand and evil and bad intentions upon the other hand, between the desire to do justice to mankind on the one hand and the desire to oppress them upon the other, which has characterized the rule of men from the beginning of time to the present day, still persists in the human heart, whether in America or in Europe. It was pronounced a short time ago upon a great political authority that hereafter the affairs of the world were to be settled by universal agreement. Consequently they proposed that we should surrender that control which we now have for the enforcement of such policies as the American people agree upon and form this internationalist government, and that there would be no differences of opinion. Universal agreement. That was the policy that was put out by the national committee of a great national party. Well, now, there is no more likelihood of the affairs of the nations being settled by universal agreement, unless there is back of the agreement some power by which the agreement can be enforced, than there is if you were to abolish the police force of your city and the constabulary of your State, that your houses and your property would be safe from attack. And it being necessary that there should be back of government power to enforce the decrees of justice as soon as they can be arrived at, let us beware of exchanging old lamps for new, unless we throw away in the exchange a matchless possession, like the lamp which brought the magic wealth to Aladdin, and who received in return for it a mere bauble. Let us beware lest in grasping the false new order that is to rule the world we find that we have merely plunged ourselves into a new disorder, and that in seeking after universal agreement and appealing to an assembly of nations with its governmental

seat upon foreign soil, the American people find too late they have surrendered the priceless blessings of liberty.

Mr. Proctor:

I congratulate you upon the success of your Sixth Annual Banquet, and bid you all good-night.

MSH 21866

END OF
TITLE